

Application No. 10/529,305

Reply to Office Action mailed on August 10, 2006

**BEST AVAILABLE COPY****RECEIVED**  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

NOV 09 2006

**Remarks/Arguments**

Claims 1-10 and 12-19 remain pending in the application. Claims 11 and 20 are cancelled by the instant amendment. Claims 1, 5 and 15 are currently amended.

**Claim Objections**

Applicant has amended each one of claims 1 and 15 to recite "two sinusoidal waves having respective frequencies that differ from each other by a factor of two," thereby using substantially the same language that was suggested by the Examiner at point 1 of the Office Action mailed on August 10, 2006. In addition, Applicant has stated specifically in the preamble of each one of claims 1 and 15 that the asymmetric waveform is generated "by an asymmetric waveform generator," in order to improve the clarity of the claims.

Applicant has amended the dependency of claim 5 to read "according to claim 2." Applicant notes that by the preliminary amendment that was filed upon National Entry, claim 5 was amended to depend only from claim 2. However, the strike-through marking that passes through the numeral "4" is not clearly visible, as it is overlapping with the horizontal-line portion of the numeral. Applicant *did* state at page 8 of the preliminary amendment "Claims 5, 12 and 13 have been amended to depend only from claim 2." In view of the previous confusion, Applicant has indicated the current amendment to claim 5 using double square brackets (i.e. "according to claim 2 [[4]],").

In view of the aforementioned amendments, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objections to claims 1-14 and 16-20. Favorable consideration is kindly requested.

**Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 101**

*Claims 1-14 and 16-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention as a whole must accomplish a practical application.*

Application No. 10/529,305

Reply to Office Action mailed on August 10, 2006

Applicant has amended claim 1 to include the additional step of “adjusting LC tuning electronics of the asymmetric waveform generator in dependence upon the determined correction, so as to control the asymmetric waveform being generated thereby.” It is respectfully submitted that amended claim 1 is now in compliance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101. In particular, the invention as claimed at amended claim 1 produces a “useful, concrete and tangible result.” The result, specifically, is adjustment of the LC tuning electronics of the asymmetric waveform generator to control (e.g. correct) the asymmetric waveform being generated thereby. Applicant respectfully submits that this result is “useful, concrete and tangible.” Favorable consideration is kindly requested.

#### **Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112**

*Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential steps, such omission amounting to a gap between the steps.*

At point 2 of the Office Action mailed on August 10, 2006, it is stated “The omitted step is: how the asymmetric waveform is controlled?” Applicant has amended claim 1 to recite “the determined correction for adjusting at least one of a phase angle difference between the two sinusoidal waves and an amplitude of at least one of the two sinusoidal waves.” An example of support for the proposed amendment may be found in the application as originally filed at claim 11. Accordingly no new matter has been added.

As was discussed *supra*, claim 1 has also been amended to specify “adjusting LC tuning electronics of the asymmetric waveform generator in dependence upon the determined correction, so as to control the asymmetric waveform being generated thereby.” Clearly, claim 1 now includes steps defining how the asymmetric waveform is controlled. In particular, the waveform is controlled by the step of adjusting LC tuning electronics of the asymmetric waveform generator in dependence upon the determined correction. Since it is also recited that the determined correction is for adjusting at least one of a phase angle difference between the two sinusoidal waves and an amplitude of at

Application No. 10/529,305

Reply to Office Action mailed on August 10, 2006

least one of the two sinusoidal waves, Applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 1 does not omit any essential steps. Favorable consideration is kindly requested.

Claim 15 also is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential steps, such omission amounting to a gap between the steps. Applicant has made the same amendments to claim 15 as were described *supra* with reference to claim 1, *mutatis mutandis*. In particular, amended claim 15 now recites specifically "adjusting LC tuning electronics of the asymmetric waveform generator in dependence upon the determined correction, so as to control at least one of the phase angle difference between the two sinusoidal waves and the amplitude of at least one of the two sinusoidal waves." Applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 15 does not omit any essential steps. Favorable consideration is kindly requested.

Since amended claim 1 is believed to be in proper condition for allowance, it is respectfully submitted that all of dependent claims 2-14 and 16-20, which depend either directly or indirectly from amended claim 1, are also in proper condition for allowance. Favorable consideration is kindly requested.

Applicant looks forward to receiving favourable consideration of the instant application.

**Please charge any additional fees required or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No: 50-1142.**

Respectfully submitted,



Gordon Freedman, Reg. No. 41,553

Freedman and Associates  
117 Centrepointhe Drive, Suite 350  
Nepean, Ontario  
K2G 5X3 Canada

Tel: (613) 274-7272  
Fax: (613) 274-7414

MW/sw